

## University of California, Hastings College of the Law UC Hastings Scholarship Repository

---

Propositions

California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives

---

2008

# 8 ELIMINATES RIGHT OF SAME-SEX COUPLES TO MARRY.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca\\_ballot\\_props](http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props)

---

### Recommended Citation

8 ELIMINATES RIGHT OF SAME-SEX COUPLES TO MARRY. California Proposition 8 (2008).  
[http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca\\_ballot\\_props/1288](http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/1288)

This Proposition is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [marcusc@uchastings.edu](mailto:marcusc@uchastings.edu).

**ELIMINATES RIGHT OF SAME-SEX COUPLES TO MARRY.  
INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

PREPARED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

**ELIMINATES RIGHT OF SAME-SEX COUPLES TO MARRY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

- Changes the California Constitution to eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry in California.
- Provides that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.

**Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:**

- Over the next few years, potential revenue loss, mainly from sales taxes, totaling in the several tens of millions of dollars, to state and local governments.
- In the long run, likely little fiscal impact on state and local governments.

## ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

### BACKGROUND

In March 2000, California voters passed Proposition 22 to specify in state law that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California. In May 2008, the California Supreme Court ruled that the statute enacted by Proposition 22 and other statutes that limit marriage to a relationship between a man and a woman violated the equal protection clause of the California Constitution. It also held that individuals of the same sex have the right to marry under the California Constitution. As a result of the ruling, marriage between individuals of the same sex is currently valid or recognized in the state.

### PROPOSAL

This measure amends the California Constitution to specify that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California. As a result, notwithstanding the California Supreme Court ruling of May 2008, marriage would be limited to individuals of the opposite sex, and individuals of the same sex would not have the right to marry in California.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

Because marriage between individuals of the same sex is currently valid in California, there would likely be an increase in spending on weddings by same-sex couples in California over the next few years. This would result in increased revenue, primarily sales tax revenue, to state and local governments.

By specifying that marriage between individuals of the same sex is not valid or recognized, this measure could result in revenue loss, mainly from sales taxes, to state and local governments. Over the next few years, this loss could potentially total in the several tens of millions of dollars. Over the long run, this measure would likely have little fiscal impact on state and local governments.

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 8 ★

Proposition 8 is simple and straightforward. It contains the same 14 words that were previously approved in 2000 by over 61% of California voters: “Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.”

Because four activist judges in San Francisco wrongly overturned the people’s vote, we need to pass this measure as a constitutional amendment to RESTORE THE DEFINITION OF MARRIAGE as a man and a woman.

Proposition 8 is about preserving marriage; *it’s not an attack on the gay lifestyle*. Proposition 8 doesn’t take away any rights or benefits of gay or lesbian domestic partnerships. Under California law, “domestic partners shall have the same rights, protections, and benefits” as married spouses. (Family Code § 297.5.) There are NO exceptions. Proposition 8 WILL NOT change this.

YES on Proposition 8 does three simple things:

*It restores the definition of marriage* to what the vast majority of California voters already approved and human history has understood marriage to be.

*It overturns the outrageous decision of four activist Supreme Court judges* who ignored the will of the people.

*It protects our children* from being taught in public schools that “same-sex marriage” is the same as traditional marriage.

Proposition 8 protects marriage as an essential institution of society. While death, divorce, or other circumstances may prevent the ideal, the best situation for a child is to be raised by a married mother and father.

The narrow decision of the California Supreme Court isn’t just about “live and let live.” State law may require teachers to instruct children as young as kindergarteners about marriage. (Education Code § 51890.) If the gay marriage ruling is not overturned, TEACHERS COULD BE REQUIRED to teach young children there is *no difference* between gay marriage and traditional marriage.

We should not accept a court decision that may result in public schools teaching our kids that gay marriage is okay. That is an issue for parents to discuss with their children according to their own values and beliefs. *It shouldn’t be forced on us against our will.*

Some will try to tell you that Proposition 8 takes away legal rights of gay domestic partnerships. That is false. Proposition 8 DOES NOT take away any of those rights and does not interfere with gays living the lifestyle they choose.

However, while gays have the right to their private lives, *they do not have the right to redefine marriage* for everyone else.

CALIFORNIANS HAVE NEVER VOTED FOR SAME-SEX MARRIAGE. If gay activists want to legalize gay marriage, they should put it on the ballot. Instead, they have gone behind the backs of voters and convinced four activist judges in San Francisco to redefine marriage for the rest of society. That is the wrong approach.

Voting YES on Proposition 8 RESTORES the definition of marriage that was approved by over 61% of voters. Voting YES overturns the decision of four activist judges. Voting YES *protects our children*.

Please vote YES on Proposition 8 to RESTORE the meaning of marriage.

**RON PRENTICE**, President  
California Family Council

**ROSEMARIE “ROSIE” AVILA**, Governing Board Member  
Santa Ana Unified School District

**BISHOP GEORGE MCKINNEY**, Director  
Coalition of African American Pastors

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 8 ★

Don’t be tricked by scare tactics.

- PROP. 8 DOESN’T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH SCHOOLS

There’s NOT ONE WORD IN 8 ABOUT EDUCATION. In fact, local school districts and parents—not the state—develop health education programs for their schools.

NO CHILD CAN BE FORCED, AGAINST THE WILL OF THEIR PARENTS, TO BE TAUGHT ANYTHING about health and family issues. CALIFORNIA LAW PROHIBITS IT.

And NOTHING IN STATE LAW REQUIRES THE MENTION OF MARRIAGE IN KINDERGARTEN!

It’s a smokescreen.

- DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS and MARRIAGE AREN’T THE SAME.

CALIFORNIA STATUTES CLEARLY IDENTIFY NINE REAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MARRIAGE AND DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS. Only marriage provides the security that spouses provide one another—it’s why people get married in the first place!

Think about it. Married couples depend on spouses when they’re sick, hurt, or aging. They accompany them into ambulances or hospital rooms, and help make life-and-death decisions, with no questions asked. ONLY MARRIAGE ENDS

THE CONFUSION AND GUARANTEES THE CERTAINTY COUPLES CAN COUNT ON IN TIMES OF GREATEST NEED.

Regardless of how you feel about this issue, we should guarantee the same fundamental freedoms to every Californian.

- PROP. 8 TAKES AWAY THE RIGHTS OF GAY AND LESBIAN COUPLES AND TREATS THEM DIFFERENTLY UNDER THE LAW.

Equality under the law is one of the basic foundations of our society.

Prop. 8 means one class of citizens can enjoy the dignity and responsibility of marriage, and another cannot. That’s unfair.

PROTECT FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS. SAY NO TO PROP. 8.

[www.NoonProp8.com](http://www.NoonProp8.com)

**ELLYNE BELL**, School Board Member  
Sacramento City Schools

**RACHAEL SALCIDO**, Associate Professor of Law  
McGeorge School of Law

**DELAINE EASTIN**  
Former California State Superintendent of Public Instruction

★ **ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 8** ★

OUR CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION—the law of our land—SHOULD GUARANTEE THE SAME FREEDOMS AND RIGHTS TO EVERYONE—NO ONE group SHOULD be singled out to BE TREATED DIFFERENTLY.

In fact, our nation was founded on the principle that all people should be treated equally. EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW IS THE FOUNDATION OF AMERICAN SOCIETY.

That's what this election is about—equality, freedom, and fairness, for all.

Marriage is the institution that conveys dignity and respect to the lifetime commitment of any couple. PROPOSITION 8 WOULD DENY LESBIAN AND GAY COUPLES that same DIGNITY AND RESPECT.

That's why Proposition 8 is wrong for California.

Regardless of how you feel about this issue, the freedom to marry is fundamental to our society, just like the freedoms of religion and speech.

PROPOSITION 8 MANDATES ONE SET OF RULES FOR GAY AND LESBIAN COUPLES AND ANOTHER SET FOR EVERYONE ELSE. That's just not fair. OUR LAWS SHOULD TREAT EVERYONE EQUALLY.

In fact, the government has no business telling people who can and cannot get married. Just like government has no business telling us what to read, watch on TV, or do in our private lives. We don't need Prop. 8; WE DON'T NEED MORE GOVERNMENT IN OUR LIVES.

REGARDLESS OF HOW ANYONE FEELS ABOUT MARRIAGE FOR GAY AND LESBIAN COUPLES, PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE SINGLED OUT FOR UNFAIR TREATMENT UNDER THE LAWS OF OUR STATE.

Those committed and loving couples who want to accept the responsibility that comes with marriage should be treated like everyone else.

DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS ARE NOT MARRIAGE.

When you're married and your spouse is sick or hurt, there is no confusion: you get into the ambulance or hospital room with no questions asked. IN EVERYDAY LIFE, AND ESPECIALLY IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS, DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS ARE SIMPLY NOT ENOUGH. Only marriage provides the certainty and the security that people know they can count on in their times of greatest need.

EQUALITY UNDER THE LAW IS A FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE. Prop. 8 separates one group of Californians from another and excludes them from enjoying the same rights as other loving couples.

Forty-six years ago I married my college sweetheart, Julia. We raised three children—two boys and one girl. The boys are married, with children of their own. Our daughter, Liz, a lesbian, can now also be married—if she so chooses.

All we have ever wanted for our daughter is that she be treated with the same dignity and respect as her brothers—with the same freedoms and responsibilities as every other Californian.

My wife and I never treated our children differently, we never loved them any differently, and now the law doesn't treat them differently, either.

Each of our children now has the same rights as the others, to choose the person to love, commit to, and to marry.

Don't take away the equality, freedom, and fairness that everyone in California—straight, gay, or lesbian—deserves.

Please join us in voting NO on Prop. 8.

**SAMUEL THORON**, Former President  
Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays  
**JULIA MILLER THORON**, Parent

★ **REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 8** ★

Proposition 8 is about traditional marriage; it is not an attack on gay relationships. Under California law gay and lesbian domestic partnerships are treated equally; they already have the same rights as married couples. Proposition 8 does not change that.

What Proposition 8 does is restore the meaning of marriage to what human history has understood it to be and over 61% of California voters approved just a few years ago.

Your YES vote ensures that the will of the people is respected. It overturns the flawed legal reasoning of four judges in San Francisco who wrongly disregarded the people's vote, and ensures that gay marriage can be legalized only through a vote of the people.

Your YES vote ensures that parents can teach their children about marriage according to their own values and beliefs without conflicting messages being forced on young children in public schools that gay marriage is okay.

Your YES vote on Proposition 8 means that only marriage between a man and a woman will be valid or recognized in California, regardless of when or where performed. But Prop. 8 will NOT take away any other rights or benefits of gay couples.

Gays and lesbians have the right to live the lifestyle they choose, but they do not have the right to redefine marriage for everyone else. Proposition 8 respects the rights of gays while still reaffirming traditional marriage.

Please vote YES on Proposition 8 to RESTORE the definition of marriage that the voters already approved.

**DR. JANE ANDERSON, M.D.**, Fellow  
American College of Pediatricians  
**ROBERT BOLINGBROKE**, Council Commissioner  
San Diego-Imperial Council, Boy Scouts of America  
**JERALEE SMITH**, Director of Education/California  
Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays and Gays (PFOX)

# QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

## PROP 7 RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

### SUMMARY

*Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Requires government-owned utilities to generate 20% of their electricity from renewable energy by 2010, a standard currently applicable to private electrical corporations. Raises requirement for all utilities to 40% by 2020 and 50% by 2025. Fiscal Impact: Increased state administrative costs up to \$3.4 million annually, paid by fees. Unknown impact on state and local government costs and revenues due to the measure's uncertain impact on retail electricity rates.

### WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

**YES** A YES vote on this measure means: Electricity providers in California, including publicly owned utilities, would be required to increase their proportion of electricity generated from renewable resources, such as solar and wind power, beyond the current requirement of 20 percent by 2010, to 40 percent by 2020 and 50 percent by 2025, or face specified penalties. The requirement for privately owned electricity providers to acquire renewable electricity would be limited by a cost cap requiring such acquisitions only when the cost is no more than 10 percent above a specified market price for electricity. Electricity providers who fail to meet the renewable resources requirements would potentially be subject to a 1 cent per kilowatt hour penalty rate set in statute, without a cap on the total annual penalty amount. The required time frames for approving new renewable electricity plants would be shortened.

**NO** A NO vote on this measure means: Electricity providers in California, except publicly owned ones, would continue to be required to increase their proportion of electricity generated from renewable resources to 20 percent by 2010. The current requirements on privately owned utilities to purchase renewable electricity would continue to be limited by an annual cost cap on the total amount of such purchases. Electricity providers would continue to be subject to the existing penalty process, in which the penalty rate (currently 5 cents per kilowatt-hour) and a total annual penalty cap (currently \$25 million per provider) are set administratively. The required time frames for approving new renewable electricity plants would not be shortened.

### ARGUMENTS

**PRO** Vote Yes on 7 to require all utilities to provide 50% renewable electricity by 2025. Support solar, wind, and geothermal power to combat rising energy costs and global warming. Proposition 7 protects consumers, and favors solar and clean energy over expensive fossil fuels and dangerous offshore drilling.

**CON** Prop. 7: opposed by leading environmental groups, renewable power providers, taxpayers, business, and labor. 7 is poorly drafted, results in *less* renewable power, *higher* electric rates, and potentially another energy crisis. 7 forces small renewable companies out of California's market. Power providers could always charge 10% above market rates.  
[www.NoProp7.com](http://www.NoProp7.com)

### FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

**FOR**  
Jim Gonzalez  
Californians for Solar and Clean Energy  
1830 N Street  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
(916) 444-2425 / 449-6190  
[jjim@jimgonzalez.com](mailto:jjim@jimgonzalez.com)  
[www.Yeson7.net](http://www.Yeson7.net)

**AGAINST**  
Californians Against Another Costly Energy Scheme  
(866) 811-9255  
[www.NoProp7.com](http://www.NoProp7.com)

## PROP 8 ELIMINATES RIGHT OF SAME-SEX COUPLES TO MARRY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

### SUMMARY

*Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Changes California Constitution to eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry. Provides that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California. Fiscal Impact: Over next few years, potential revenue loss, mainly sales taxes, totaling in the several tens of millions of dollars, to state and local governments. In the long run, likely little fiscal impact on state and local governments.

### WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

**YES** A YES vote on this measure means: The California Constitution will specify that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.

**NO** A NO vote on this measure means: Marriage between individuals of the same sex would continue to be valid or recognized in California.

### ARGUMENTS

**PRO** Proposition 8 restores what 61% of voters already approved: marriage is only between a man and a woman. Four judges in San Francisco should not have overturned the people's vote. Prop. 8 fixes that mistake by reaffirming traditional marriage, but doesn't take away any rights or benefits from gay domestic partners.

**CON** Equality under the law is a fundamental freedom. Regardless of how we feel about marriage, singling people out to be treated differently is wrong. Prop. 8 won't affect our schools, but it will mean loving couples are treated differently under our Constitution and denied equal protection under the law. [www.NoonProp8.com](http://www.NoonProp8.com)

### FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

**FOR**  
ProtectMarriage.com – Yes on Proposition 8  
915 L Street #C-259  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 446-2956  
[www.protectmarriage.com](http://www.protectmarriage.com)

**AGAINST**  
Equality for ALL  
NO on Proposition 8  
921 11th Street, 10th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 717-1411  
[www.NoonProp8.com](http://www.NoonProp8.com)



consistent with Section 25740.1, the Public Utilities Commission shall encourage and give the highest priority to allocations for the construction of, or payment to supplement the construction of, any new or modified electric transmission facilities necessary to facilitate the state achieving its renewables portfolio standard targets.

(c) All projects receiving funding, in whole or in part, pursuant to this section shall be considered public works projects subject to the provisions of Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 1720) of Part 7 of Division 2 of the Labor Code, and the Department of Industrial Relations shall have the same authority and responsibility to enforce those provisions as it has under the Labor Code.

SEC. 28. Section 25745 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:

25745. The Energy Commission shall use its best efforts to attract and encourage investment in solar and clean energy resources, facilities, research and development from companies based in the United States to fulfill the purposes of this chapter.

SEC. 29. Section 25751.5 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:

25751.5. (a) The Solar and Clean Energy Transmission Account is hereby established within the Renewable Resources Trust Fund.

(b) Beginning January 1, 2009, the total annual adjustments adopted pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 399.8 of the Public Utilities Code shall be allocated to the Solar and Clean Energy Transmission Account.

(c) Funds in the Solar and Clean Energy Transmission Account shall be used, in whole or in part, for the following purposes:

(1) The purchase of property or right-of-way pursuant to the commission's authority under Chapter 8.9 (commencing with Section 25790).

(2) The construction of, or payment to supplement the construction of, any new or modified electric transmission facilities necessary to facilitate the state achieving its renewables portfolio standard targets.

(d) Title to any property or project paid for in whole pursuant to this section shall vest with the commission. Title to any property or project paid for in part pursuant to this section shall vest with the commission in a part proportionate to the commission's share of the overall cost of the property or project.

(e) Funds deposited in the Solar and Clean Energy Transmission Account shall be used to supplement, and not to supplant, existing state funding for the purposes authorized by subdivision (c).

(f) All projects receiving funding, in whole or in part, pursuant to this section shall be considered public works projects subject to the provisions of Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 1720) of Part 7 of Division 2 of the Labor Code, and the Department of Industrial Relations shall have the same authority and responsibility to enforce those provisions as it has under the Labor Code.

SEC. 30. Chapter 8.9 (commencing with Section 25790) is added to Division 15 of the Public Resources Code, to read:

25790. The Energy Commission may, for the purposes of this chapter, purchase and subsequently sell, lease to another party for a period not to exceed 99 years, exchange, subdivide, transfer, assign, pledge, encumber, or otherwise dispose of any real or personal property or any interest in property. Any such lease or sale shall be conditioned on the development and use of the property for the generation and/or transmission of renewable energy.

25791. Any lease or sale made pursuant to this chapter may be made without public bidding but only after a public hearing.

SEC. 31. Severability

The provisions of this act are severable. If any provision of this act, or part thereof, is for any reason held to be invalid under state or federal law, the remaining provisions shall not be affected, but shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 32. Amendment

The provisions of this act may be amended to carry out its purpose and intent by statutes approved by a two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

SEC. 33. Conflicting Measures

(a) This measure is intended to be comprehensive. It is the intent of the people that in the event that this measure and another initiative measure relating to the same subject appear on the same statewide election ballot, the provisions of the other measure or measures are deemed to be in conflict with this measure. In the event this measure shall receive the greater number of affirmative votes, the provisions of this measure shall prevail in their entirety, and all provisions of the other measure or measures shall be null and void.

(b) If this measure is approved by voters but superseded by law by any other conflicting ballot measure approved by the voters at the same election, and the conflicting ballot measure is later held invalid, this measure shall be self-

executing and given full force of law.

SEC. 34. Legal Challenge

Any challenge to the validity of this act must be filed within six months of the effective date of this act.

## PROPOSITION 8

This initiative measure is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article II, Section 8, of the California Constitution.

This initiative measure expressly amends the California Constitution by adding a section thereto; therefore, new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

SECTION 1. Title

This measure shall be known and may be cited as the "California Marriage Protection Act."

SECTION 2. Section 7.5 is added to Article I of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 7.5. *Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.*

## PROPOSITION 9

This initiative measure is submitted to the people of California in accordance with the provisions of Section 8 of Article II of the California Constitution.

This initiative measure amends a section of the California Constitution and amends and adds sections to the Penal Code; therefore, existing provisions proposed to be deleted are printed in ~~strikeout type~~ and new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

### PROPOSED LAW

#### VICTIMS' BILL OF RIGHTS ACT OF 2008: MARSY'S LAW

SECTION 1. TITLE

This act shall be known, and may be cited as, the "Victims' Bill of Rights Act of 2008: Marsy's Law."

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

The People of the State of California hereby find and declare all of the following:

1. Crime victims are entitled to justice and due process. Their rights include, but are not limited to, the right to notice and to be heard during critical stages of the justice system; the right to receive restitution from the criminal wrongdoer; the right to be reasonably safe throughout the justice process; the right to expect the government to properly fund the criminal justice system, so that the rights of crime victims stated in these Findings and Declarations and justice itself are not eroded by inadequate resources; and, above all, the right to an expeditious and just punishment of the criminal wrongdoer.

2. The People of the State of California declare that the "Victims' Bill of Rights Act of 2008: Marsy's Law" is needed to remedy a justice system that fails to fully recognize and adequately enforce the rights of victims of crime. It is named after Marsy, a 21-year-old college senior at U.C. Santa Barbara who was preparing to pursue a career in special education for handicapped children and had her whole life ahead of her. She was murdered on November 30, 1983. Marsy's Law is written on behalf of her mother, father, and brother, who were often treated as though they had no rights, and inspired by hundreds of thousands of victims of crime who have experienced the additional pain and frustration of a criminal justice system that too often fails to afford victims even the most basic of rights.

3. The People of the State of California find that the "broad reform" of the criminal justice system intended to grant these basic rights mandated in the Victims' Bill of Rights initiative measure passed by the electorate as Proposition 8 in 1982 has not occurred as envisioned by the people. Victims of crime continue to be denied rights to justice and due process.

4. An inefficient, overcrowded, and arcane criminal justice system has failed to build adequate jails and prisons, has failed to efficiently conduct court proceedings, and has failed to expeditiously finalize the sentences and punishments of criminal wrongdoers. Those criminal wrongdoers are being released from custody after serving as little as 10 percent of the sentences imposed and determined to be appropriate by judges.

5. Each year hundreds of convicted murderers sentenced to serve life in prison seek release on parole from our state prisons. California's "release from prison parole procedures" torture the families of murdered victims and waste